

# MEETING MINUTES

---

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)

DATE: AUGUST 10, 2004

TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.

LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM 6F

---

## **WEAT Members:**

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Patricia Carlson (a DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

## **DET Governance:**

- Michelle Eldridge (DET Domain Manager Team Lead)
- Molly Conroy (DET Governance Support Staff)

## **DET Development and Operations:**

- Phil Schwarz (DET Operations Representative)

## **DET Infrastructure and Networks:**

- Erik Mickelson (DET Infrastructure and Networks)

## **Guests:**

- Dana Perry (DET Server Consolidation)
- Betsy Paque (DET Administrator's Office)

*Bud Borja and Mickey Crittenden were absent from the meeting.*

---

## **Agenda Items**

1. Approval of July 27, 2004 Minutes
2. Review of July 27, 2004 Action Items
3. Review and Approve Updated WEAT Charter
4. Review, Discuss and Approve One Page WEAT Principles Document
5. Review initial WEAT task list and discuss options for "chunking" project components
  - 5.1. Define Next Steps for developing project plan and updating WEAT business plan.
  - 5.2. Assign Deliverables, Tasks for to 8-24 WEAT Meeting
6. Portal RFP Update
  - 6.1. General Update and Clarification of WEAT's Role
  - 6.2. Discussion of GA Portal Architecture – Can we do something like this?
  - 6.3. Define Current Environment
    1. Data Integration - Enterprise Services Bus
    2. Online Payment
    3. Search Engine

4. Email
5. Web Trends
6. Web Load or other Agency Web Performance Tools
7. Web Content Meta-tagging standards
8. Payment
9. Authentication
- 6.4. Define Future Needs
  1. Customization/Personalization
  2. Aggregation
  3. Application Navigation and Integration
  4. Content Publishing and Integration
  5. Security
  6. Transaction Management
  7. Administration
  8. Architectural Issues (i.e. scalability, extensibility, globalization, programmability)
  9. Collaboration
  10. Accessibility, specifically ADA Section 508
  11. Multi- lingual Translation

#### 7. Presentation of Server Consolidation Assessment Documents – Dana Perry

#### 8. Review list of action items and assignments for next WEAT meeting

### Action Items / Issues to Address

- Patricia will send Technical Reference Model (TRM) information to Mickey and Keith.
- Patricia will send the AIM-IT data model to the team and will be meeting with Patrick Farley on working with the local units of government.
- Patricia will continue to have conversations with Jim Schmolesky on getting another DET Development and Operations staff person.
- Patricia will set up a joint meeting with WEAT, the server domain subcommittee, the server consolidation team, and DET Development and Operations staff to discuss issues of long term architectural decision implications.
- Patricia will provide a summary of agency IT plans at the next WEAT meeting.
- Patricia will forward supporting materials on the RFP process.
- WEAT members will articulate portal requirements information to Betsy Paque by August 20.
- When leading contenders for the portal development / content management system are determined, WEAT recommends requesting a proof-of-concept from a vendor before signing a contract to make sure the product performs as represented.
- WEAT recommends the state determine business and technical relevance for requirements to be prepared to create environment for testing the portal development / content management system.
- WEAT members need to look at where products and recent state procurements touch portal and identify likely interfaces.
- WEAT recommends the state develop a list of standards and technologies and assemble in them in a meaningful way to evaluate portal development / content management system demos.
- Michelle Eldridge will provide an "A-list" of application ideas from portal governance group.
- WEAT will submit comments to the Server Consolidation Team, from an architectural perspective, regarding the server consolidation appraisal documents.
- Patricia will continue to look for additional procurement activities and forward information to WEAT.
- Patricia will continue to discuss getting more broad-based agency input into IT governance and grant application coordination efforts with Matt.
- Patricia will provide WEAT an update of her status meetings with Matt.
- Molly will draft meeting minutes and provide them to WEAT for review.
- WEAT support staff will update the WEAT Web site with today's meeting documents.

## Meeting Notes

### 1. Introduction to Meeting / Approval of July 27, 2004 Minutes

Patricia Carlson opened the meeting and announced two guest speakers for the meeting. Betsy Paque would be attending to talk about portal and content management software and the RFP process. The effort to revamp the portal has been from the Governor's Office. The business requirements for the project will be handled by the portal governance group. Matt Miszewski, State CIO, appreciates the concerns expressed by the WEAT members, and has stated that WEAT's role is to clarify information on the best portal software and connection points with future enterprise direction (e.g. ADA requirements). The state needs a product that will have a useful life and ability to integrate with local levels of government. IBM and CGI-AMS have presented information on their products. CGI-AMS has a product that runs on kiosks, which is a potential future direction for portal deployment. The Department of Transportation (DOT) also has considered plans for kiosks for information on Marquette interchange work. WEAT will provide additional support for the RFP process. WEAT discussed and expressed concern that the portal software choice not skew future choices for the application architecture. Matt hopes WEAT will have a vision for a service-based architecture.

Dana Perry will attend to take questions on server consolidation documents, and talk about next steps.

Patricia is looking at detailed timing of enterprise initiatives. DET staff has been pulling together information for Matt that reflects the enterprise, including demographics, state finances, information on legislative landscape, and agency trends. Matt wants a broad scope to create a vision for IT. The approach to the enterprise IT plan is to look toward future. DOT tried similar a exercise for a longer horizon and to find out what customers want.

**Action:** *Patricia will forward supporting materials on the RFP process.  
The draft minutes from the July 27, 2004 meeting were adopted without any changes.*

### 2. Review of July 27, 2004 Action Items

Patricia is continuing to update DET Senior Leadership on WEAT issues and activities at her status meetings. She has been talking to Matt and Dave about providing consulting services to the enterprise. Matt likes the idea of WEAT doing outreach to the agencies. Patricia will start sending a bulleted list of items from her status meetings with Matt to WEAT.

Patricia has sent the updated WEAT charter and will continue editing principles into Working Council of CIOs format.

Patricia sent information on the Federal GeoSpatial One Stop and the State of New Jersey pilot of State-Federal Integration with the GeoSpatial One Stop. New Jersey has been connecting all geospatial information in the state. Federal money is available to states looking to do pilot work. ESRI has grants available to states looking to participate in the GeoSpatial One Stop. Art Przybyl should have a draft proposal to Matt for offerings of a GIS Center of Excellence.

Patricia forwarded Jay's detailed comments on the proposed security policy for the ID/Password Management Standard.

WEAT members discussed Matt's request for a recommendation for an operating system for the identity access management software. WEAT is waiting for vendor information for the Information identity access RFP. Jay suggested focusing on common infrastructure as there are many platforms to be considered. The State needs to have these kinds of systems run on major, robust infrastructure. WEAT expects that the state will not be able to settle on a single platform and will probably have primary and secondary choices. DET Development and Operations staff is trying to get a handle on what exists in DET. WEAT members would like to meet with staff in the DET operations area and the

server domain. WEAT wants to have a reasonable number of platforms and find out what major UNIX platforms should exist in the enterprise. A decision still needs to be made to determine a platform.

WEAT members suggested the need for context around decisions when announcements are distributed. Decision makers need to communicate with the domains to keep relationships open.

WEAT members discussed the issues of initiatives driving architectural decisions. As infrastructure pieces are coming into place, WEAT feels it is important to know how these pieces will fit together. Buying products doesn't solve architectural issues. The state will need to focus on directory as an important architectural component, and the state needs to define the big picture – and WEAT can presumably help with that. WEAT will need to identify components that need integration and which are needed to build a larger technical architecture. WEAT needs to develop an initial TRM so that it can begin applying the TRM to emerging initiatives. There is value in defining process for relating enterprise initiatives through EA. The process can lead to use cases and prioritization within the EA.

DET has made a purchase decision on Cape Clear and now WEAT sees a need for a strategy and implementation vision around using that choice.

WEAT needs to get a clear picture and more information on the Governor's vision for the portal to correct the development trajectory. Architectural vision comes from business needs. Business area staff should be defining business components. WEAT will help articulate technical requirements for development of the portal. WEAT will need information documenting the current web environment.

Agencies have their own interpretation of the Governor's goals. The Department of Workforce Development (DWD) has list of priorities from the Governor's office, and is using the Web as a mechanism to interact with customers, but is not sure how that integrates with other agencies (e.g., Job Net). The Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) will be offering more self services for motor vehicle transactions.

The portal initiative is a fertile moment for EA, as it is an intersection of enterprise activities (the portal, the enterprise services bus (ESB), and Identity Access Management (IAM)). WEAT members see a need to put "stakes" in the ground with the TRM (and we need the initial TRM to be able to do that).. It will be helpful to consider products in context of how they will compliment or compete with other enterprise initiatives. WEAT needs to define interface standards that should be used to access applications from the portal. The portal product needs to be flexible to change with the environment.

The architecture could suggest a governance model around stewardship and governance concerns. Defining the architecture already in place and what needs to be integrated will help those defining business drivers. This will be discussed in future meetings.

Every application developed should have flexibility designed in for future use. Staff will need to learn how to develop applications so they can plug into a portal. Staff need a clear understanding of what products can do and how to get applications to work together. Issues of code reuse, including being able to take a whole application and leverage it in multiple ways, demonstrate the need for vision to architect applications to gain flexibility.

WEAT, the server domain subcommittee, the server consolidation team, and DET Development and Operations staff need to get together for good recommendation for Matt. These groups need to talk about getting down for a couple versions of UNIX to set stakes in the ground for future issues. These "stakes" will lead to inclusion in future procurements (e.g., what platforms a product supports). Similar to Georgia's Enterprise Portal Interoperability Architecture paper, Wisconsin's portal product would have to work with current architectural decisions.

Keith, Jay, and Erik will articulate portal information to Betsy to help the portal governance team to understand aspects and impacts of what they will do and how it will impact the enterprise. This will help with a vision. WEAT members will need an expectation to define the environment with which

portal must interact and where can portal be leveraged. This group will need to find commonalities and look at business requirements in agency IT plans. WEAT will work with the applications domain, as WEAT doesn't have all technical expertise. WEAT would also like to have a sounding session with Matt on perceived or real impediments to vision of open source platforms.

The August Business Leadership Council (BLC) meeting has been cancelled. Gina Frank Reese will be joining DOA as the Deputy Secretary and will be helping to pull together initiatives, including the portal.

Diane Kohn, Patricia Carlson, and Judy Heil are working with Crowe Chizek on server consolidation.

**Action:** *Patricia will set up a joint meeting with WEAT, the server domain subcommittee, the server consolidation team, and DET Development and Operations staff to discuss issues of long term architectural decision implications.  
Patricia will provide a summary of agency IT plans at the next WEAT meeting.*

### 3. Portal RFP Update

Betsy Paque has been asked to take the portal RFP and prepare it for release. Mike Corbett, DET staff, has added pieces on research into applications, and information from [FirstGov](#), the federal portal. This effort stems from the TLC discussion of how to handle portal development and tie it into rates and charging back mechanisms for enterprise applications while separating DET work on the portal.

The message from the portal governance group to the group doing the portal procurement is to look at tools. The current portal doesn't facilitate getting to applications on the web. The goal of a portal redesign is to move from collection of links to making better use of portal.

The portal governance group is working on developing a mission, strategy, and a set of objectives. Betsy's role is to facilitate choosing a tool. The state will need to get an enterprise license to allow more participation of counties and local units of government to bridge the enterprise. The tool must be flexible to meet the needs of enterprise entities. Additionally, financial issues must be addressed. Contracts should not charge on a per user basis.

Betsy is taking technical requirements from large and small agencies and local governments and the University (UW). This group took a stab at the technical requirements and gave feedback. The drawback to this method is that it turned into a "wish list" of over 200 requirements. Betsy will work to prioritize the list to determine mandatory vs. desirable requirements. The final product will include desirable features in the RFP for vendors.

Procurement staff will add contract language including licensing pieces. The RFP will be released August 23 and vendors will have three weeks to respond. Decisions have not yet been made on holding vendor conferences and whether or not to ask specific vendors for product demos. A vendor conference to answer vendor questions is likely to be scheduled. After those items are determined, the intent is to make an award and have a purchase order out in early October.

WEAT members suggested additions to the solicitation process. A WEAT member suggested creating specifications for mandatory requirements and looking at state of the art vendors for market research. When leading contenders are determined, WEAT recommends requesting a proof-of-concept and trial period from a vendor before signing a contract to make sure a product performs as represented.

Jay, Keith, Erik will look at the portal architecture (e.g., ESB and IAM working with portal) to provide integration standards that should be cited in the solicitation. They will identify major ways the portal is likely to interact with applications.

This tool procurement has to move forward. Three to five applications will be chosen to be deployed to the portal for January. The portal governance team is looking for things that are a clear fit to the portal and don't require major new development. Business input will be vital for a vision of the portal future. Portal architecture information needs to fit with this vision.

WEAT discussed the risk of rushing to enable self-service of web delivery poses to the long term vision of integration. The top technical risk of this procurement needs to be determined.

There is potential for more architectural issue discussion on portal architecture. This is an opportunity to work with the portal governance group and the applications domain to create a vision for portal interaction with applications and other agency Web sites.

Other risks include portal to infrastructure issues. It will have to be determined if a portal solution will interact with infrastructure already chosen (e.g., Oracle Collaboration Server). Vendors must describe how they handle services. The state will need standards in the specs (e.g., MAPI and SMTP for e-mail) to use those qualifications for rating vendor responses.

Included in the "hot spots" of architecture that come into play with the portal, vendor responses will help with rating a process for ranking technology. For each response, rather than testing scenarios, the state should create minimum levels to identify requirements. Requirements should relate to the architecture to determine how product will play in current and future architectures.

A test team should be formed while the solicitation is on the street to develop a mock-up application for testing to validate key functionality. The state needs to be prepared to create an environment for testing. The state also needs to determine business and technical relevance for requirements. Business area experts and technical experts should be engaged in developing testing scenarios. WEAT will need to identify where requirements meet architectural boundaries. The portal solicitation has two main aspects: validation of a vendor and definition of interaction between the portal and its environment.

Matt and Werner addressed the WEAT members and presented a diagram of a vision for the portal.

**Action:** *Patricia will forward supporting materials on the RFP process.*

*WEAT members will articulate portal requirements information to Betsy Paque by August 20. When leading contenders for the portal development / content management system are determined, WEAT recommends requesting a proof-of-concept from a vendor before signing a contract to make sure the product performs as represented.*

*WEAT recommends the state determine business and technical relevance for requirements to be prepared to create environment for testing the portal development / content management system.*

*WEAT members need to look at where products and recent state procurements touch portal and identify likely interfaces.*

*WEAT recommends the state develop a list of standards and technologies and assemble in them in a meaningful way to evaluate portal development / content management system solicitation responses.*

*Michelle Eldridge will provide an "A-list" of application ideas from portal governance group.*

#### 4. Presentation of Server Consolidation Assessment Documents

Dana Perry attended the meeting to answer questions on the Server Consolidation Assessment Documents.

WEAT members asked questions regarding the assessment of costs for getting started and ROI and achieving agency buy-in for the consolidation. Dana referred to the [Server Consolidation Frequently Asked Questions](#) document. Crowe didn't put in percentages into the Cost Benefit Analysis due to the dependence of which number is used to calculate the totals.

A WEAT member suggested presenting the server consolidation information to the state's budget analysts. While the server consolidation team didn't get feedback from agencies to create a financial group, Dana intends to get input on chargeback methodologies.

WEAT members had questions on dealing with human side of the consolidation. The consolidation team will need a human resources advisory group. This group could create liaisons to build relationships with private industries and create a skills inventory. This group can also facilitate courses for resume writing and interview skills for jobs in private industry. State workers need to sell their skills that aren't available in private industry.

WEAT members asked about reducing the number of environments supported in agencies. The current assumption is that there will be fewer products in the environment, but is not currently a technology project. This aspect of the consolidations will need a technical architect. WEAT will play a major role as an advisory committee.

A WEAT member suggested taking into account "level of savings" vs. "level of distraction" to agencies involved in server consolidation. This distraction will continue in agencies' IT operations which is a concern for value proposition of this equation. Loss of agency focus is a significant risk.

WEAT members also expressed concerns about the network analysis. Agency comments will be provided to the domain managers for inclusion into feed back on the appraisal documents. WEAT members asked about the status of midterm capacity planning. The network needs to be built well ahead of its need.

The server consolidation project group will be working with the domains as advisory groups to be consulted for strategic issues, etc. The server consolidation project group will be creating two new subgroups for human resources and for security for justice, law enforcement, and military organizations.

**Action:** *WEAT will submit comments to the Server Consolidation Team, from an architectural perspective, regarding the server consolidation appraisal documents.*

The WEAT meeting was then adjourned.

***The next meeting is Tuesday, August 24, 8:30 to 12:30 in room 6F.***

###